

DE-RP27-09RV15051 – 222-S Laboratory Analytical Services & Testing

RFP Questions/Answers 1-23

Question/Comment #1

Section B.1 (a) to (e) includes a column entitled Estimated Cost. Beneath this title appears “To be inserted by Offeror.” Should section B.1 be submitted as part of the proposal?

Answer # 1

Yes, Section B.1 should be submitted as part of the proposal. Each Offeror should propose an Estimate Cost (and Award Fee) for each CLIN identified in Section B.1.

Question/Comment #2

Section C.2.3.6 refers to pensions and other benefit plans. Is the LAS&T contractor responsible for the pension costs for the retired employees who are not employed by LAS&T?

Answer # 2

Yes, the contractor will be responsible for funding the retirees assigned to the work scope associated with the lab. This is done on an actuarial basis looking at the past employees and the factors that contribute to the cost of their benefits. Each of the plan sponsors has a liability or funding obligation for the retirees that are associated with their current scope of work. This is calculated by the plan’s actuary on an annual basis. Pension costs are an allowable cost under the contract that will be reimbursed by the Government.

Question/Comment #3

Section H.11 specifies that the following days are to be observed as holidays:

- ☐ New Year’s Day
- ☐ Martin Luther King’s Birthday
- ☐ President’s Day
- ☐ Memorial Day
- ☐ Independence Day
- ☐ Labor Day
- ☐ Columbus Day
- ☐ Veterans Day
- ☐ Thanksgiving Day
- ☐ Christmas Day

Can alternative days be proposed by the Offeror? Additionally, Hanford Site contractors, by practice, observe 9 holidays. The ten holidays identified in this section does not meet the current Hanford Site practice.

Answer #3

A RFP amendment will be issued to update H.11 to reflect the following nine holiday/closure days currently observed by the Hanford Atomic Trade Commission Agreement: New Year’s Day, George Washington’s Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day,

Thanksgiving Day, Friday after Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Eve and Christmas Day. The Government will not consider alternate days proposed an Offeror.

Question/Comment 4

Section H26 uses the term “Project Manager.” Other sections of the RFP refer to the “Laboratory Manager.” For the purposes of this RFP, is the term “Project Manager” synonymous with the term “Laboratory Manager.”

Answer #4

Yes, for this RFP, “Project Manager” and “Laboratory Manager” are synonymous. A RFP amendment will be issued to replace any “Project Manger” references in H.26 with “Laboratory Manager.”

Question/Comment #5

Table L.1 presents the Anticipated Funding Profile. Should the table also include the funding profile of the first three months of FY2015? Should this three-month period also be included in the pricing sheets? What is the purpose of "anticipated funding profile"? Is it the annual ceiling of funding or a firm fixed price?

Answer #5

A RFP amendment will be issued to update L.5, Table L.1, to include a funding profile of \$2.25M for the 1st quarter of FY2015. Additionally, Section L, Attachments L-7 and L-8 will be updated to include columns for FY2015. The funding profile is provided for proposal preparation purposes and as stated in M.5(a), the funding profile will be used in the evaluation of cost reasonableness.

Question/Comment # 6

Please provide clarification with regard to Major subcontractor – L.2(b) states *The term “major subcontractor” as used in this Section L is defined as proposed subcontractors with a proposed subcontract annual cost equal to \$10 Million or more at any tier of the proposed organization.* This statement appears to be incorrect as the Government Funding is only \$9M per year. Other areas of the solicitation state Joint Ventures, LLC Members or Subcontract (\$650 thousand or more) listed separately.

Answer #6

The dollar amount included in L.2(b) should be \$650K in lieu of \$10M. A RFP amendment will be issued to correct this oversight on the part of the Government.

Question/Comment #7

Section L.5 (d) *The Offeror shall propose total estimated Cost and Award fee in accordance with Section B.1. In demonstrating their compliance with funding restrictions, the Offeror shall spread the proposed award fee over the number of months covering contract performance for the base period and each of the option periods. The Offeror should then apply the results to the number of months on each fiscal year to calculate fee for each fiscal year.*

Where in section B.1 should the award fee be shown?

Answer #7

The award fee should be shown separately for each individual CLIN in Section B.1. as indicated under the CLIN Descriptions.

Question/Comment #8

Please confirm that the pricing spreadsheets (Attachments L-7 and L-8) require the pricing to be provided by Government Fiscal Year?

Answer #8

Yes, all pricing should be proposed by Government Fiscal Year as indicated in L.5(c).

Question/Comment #9

In Attachment L-9 both the “Retirement and Savings” and “Medically Related Payments” seem lower than current Hanford Site benefit plan. Could the rates be confirmed to be correct?

Answer #9

Each year the contractors enter data into the Work Force Information System (WFIS) database. The percentages provided came directly from data provided by the current contractor. Each of the Hanford Site contractors will have a different percentage when it comes to the Retirement & Savings portion due to the makeup of their employee group and the amount that the participants contribute to their 401(k) savings plan.

Question/Comment #10

SDB Participation Attachment 10 – this solicitation is set aside for small business only, please confirm whether or not Attachment 10 SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION PROGRAM TARGETS FORM is required for this solicitation.

Answer #10

In accordance with (IAW) FAR 19.1202-2(b), the requirement for a SDB participation evaluation factor shall not be included in Small Business set-asides. A RFP amendment will be issued to remove Attachment L-10 from the RFP.

Question/Comment #11

Is the LAS&T contractor provided with the Government line of credit as other Hanford Site prime contractors?

Answer #11

No, the LAS&T contractor will continue to utilize standard invoicing submission procedures IAW with G.6. “Billing Instructions.”

Question/Comment #12

Section L.3.b.6 -- The application of requirements under FAR clause 52.219-24, Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Program - Targets, is prescribed by FAR clause 19.1204(a), Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Program Procedures. However, clause 19.1202-2, which defines the overall applicability of Subpart 19.12, Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Program, and thereby the circumstances in which FAR clause 52.219-24

should and should not be applied, states in subsection 19.1202-2(b) "The extent of participation of SDB concerns in performance of the contract in the authorized NAICS Industry Subsector shall not be evaluated in: (1) Small business set-asides (see Subpart 19.5), HUBZone set-asides (see Subpart 19.13), and service-disabled veteran-owned small business set-asides (see Subpart 19.14).". In light of this broader reading of FAR Subpart 19.12, would DOE agree to remove the requirements of FAR clause 52.219-24?

Answer #12

IAW FAR 19.1202-2(b), the requirement for a SDB participation evaluation factor shall not be included in Small Business set-asides. A RFP amendment will be issued to remove the requirements of FAR 52.219-24 "Small Disadvantage Business Program –Targets."

Question/Comment #13

Section L, Attachment L-10 -- The instructions state "The Offeror shall provide written Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Program Targets using the form herein, and in accordance with the instructions found in Paragraph (b) of the Section L.10 provision of this Solicitation entitled FAR 52.219-24, Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Program – Targets (OCT 2000)." Section L.10 of the RFP covers FAR 52.204-6, DATA UNIVERSAL NUMBERING SYSTEM (DUNS) NUMBER. The Attachment further states "SDB targets will be evaluated under the Project Management and Execution Subfactor" which does not exist as an evaluation factor. Section M.4.a.1.i.5 does say SDB participation will be evaluated, "The Offeror's proposed small disadvantaged business participation considering the extent of participation in terms of the total value of the acquisition." Please clarify these instructions.

Answer #13

IAW FAR 19.1202-2(b), the requirement for a SDB participation evaluation factor shall not be included in Small Business set-asides. A RFP amendment will be issued to remove the following from the RFP: L.3(a)(5), L.3(b)(6), Attachment L-10, and M.4(a)(1)(i)(5).

Question/Comment #14

How many employees currently work for the incumbent contractor at 222-S? In what rate/job classes are they categorized?

Answer #14

The incumbent contractor currently employs 71 individuals at the 222-S Laboratory. Please see RFP Section L, Attachment L-9, for the Current Average Wage Rates and Labor Classifications of Incumbent Employees in Non-Managerial Positions.

Question/Comment #15

The 2004 contract was valued at \$58 million. The current RFP suggests a contract value of \$45 million over five years. Can you explain why the new contract is \$13 million less than the last contract?

Answer #15

The estimated value of the follow-on contract is less than the current contract primarily due to 222-S Laboratory customers (other Hanford Site Contractors) budgetary cuts. As a result of the

budget cuts, the estimated number of annual analyses to be performed by the LAS&T contractor has been reduced. The current contract includes a volume of 25,000 analyses annually and the RFP includes a volume of 15,000 analyses annually (see C.2.2.) .

Question/Comment #16

Since most of the United States switched to Daylight Savings Time (DST) on March 8, 2009, will the deadlines be amended to Eastern Daylight Time (EDT) instead of Eastern Standard Time (EST)?

Answer #16

Yes, RFP Section L, Clause L.6, will be revised to replace EST with EDT.

Question/Comment #17

Will 11x17 pages be counted as one or two pages per side?

Answer #17

11x17 pages will be counted as two pages per side.

Question/Comment #18

Page J-5—The links to the referenced *pdf* documents don't function. Are these documents available elsewhere?

Answer #18

The *pdf* files referenced in Section J, Attachment 2 "222-S Laboratory Documented Safety Analysis," will be posted to the 222-S LAS&T acquisition website (<http://www.emcbc.doe.gov/ORP>) RFP page as separate files in Section J.

Question/Comment #19

Page L-4, Section L.2(b) states: *"The term "major subcontractor" as used in this Section L is defined as proposed subcontractors with a proposed annual cost equal to \$10M or more at any tier of the propose organization."* This definition exceeds the annual funding for this project. Similarly, Section M.4(3) identifies major subcontractors as *"greater than \$5 Million annually at any tier"* which would represent 50% of anticipated annual funding for this contract. Can you clarify and identify what annual subcontract value should we use?

Answer #19

The dollar amount included in L.2(b) and M.4(3) should be \$650K in lieu of \$10M and \$5M, respectively. A RFP amendment will be issued to correct this oversight on the part of the Government.

Question/Comment #20

Page M-4, Section M.4(a)(1).5 will evaluate the offeror on *"...proposed small disadvantaged business participation considering the extent of participation in terms of the total value of the*

acquisition.” However, there is no corresponding instructions provided on Page L-11, Section L.4(a) Criterion 1 – Technical Approach. Can you clarify what is required under this section?

Answer #20

IAW FAR 19.1202-2(b), the requirement for a SDB participation evaluation factor shall not be included in Small Business set-asides. A RFP amendment will be issued to remove paragraph M.4(a)(1)(i)(5).

Question/Comment #21

As a small business set-aside contract, is Attachment L-10, Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Program Targets Form applicable to this solicitation? If so, can you please clarify guidance in FAR clause subpart 19.1102 (Price Evaluation Adjustment for Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns), implemented on September 30, 2005, which implies that price evaluation adjustment should not be used for acquisitions that are set aside for small business concerns.

Answer #21

IAW FAR 19.1202-2(b), the requirement for a SDB participation evaluation factor shall not be included in Small Business set-asides. A RFP amendment will be issued to remove Attachment L-10.

Question/Comment #22

Page C-14, Section C.3.3—Who provides maintenance and support for the LIMS? Is that the responsibility of the LAS&T contractor?

Answer # 22

The LAS&T Contractor will use the LIMS for data input, but the LAS&T Contractor is not responsible for programming updates/changes or maintenance. The LAS&T Contractor may request LIMS modifications.

Question/Comment #23

Is the LAS&T contractor required, as other Hanford Site prime contractors, to participate in community relations activities?

Answer #23

Yes, the LAS&T Contractor will be required to participate in community relations activities. A RFP amendment will be issued to incorporate the following DEAR clause in Section I to capture this term and condition: 970.5226-3 Community Commitment (Dec 2000).

Additionally, the Government has received questions with regard to contacting incumbent employees regarding future employment. Offerors are to follow L.13 of the RFP when contacting incumbent employees regarding future employment opportunities.